

The jury then retired and after due deliberation returned a verdict for the Government. On December 1, 1922, the claimant filed a motion for a new trial which motion was overruled, to which ruling the claimant excepted. On December 30, 1922, judgment of condemnation and forfeiture was entered, and it was ordered by the court that the product be relabeled and sold by the United States marshal, with the proviso in said judgment that the product might be released to the claimant, Idie C. Goodwin, for and on behalf of L. H. Goodwin & Co., upon payment of the costs of the proceedings and the execution of a bond in the sum of \$100, in conformity with section 10 of the act, conditioned in part that the product be relabeled in a manner satisfactory to this department. On January 13, 1923, the claimant having theretofore filed a motion that the verdict of the jury be set aside and judgment entered for the claimant, and said motion having been overruled and exception to said ruling having been duly taken by the claimant, the above judgment was corrected to incorporate said motion, ruling, and exception. The claimant having perfected an appeal, the case is now pending on appeal in the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Sixth Circuit.

HOWARD M. GOBE, *Acting Secretary of Agriculture.*

**11785. Adulteration of canned cherries. U. S. v. 400 Cases of Cherries. Decree of condemnation and forfeiture. Product released under bond.** (F. & D. No. 16862. I. S. No. 8855-v. S. No. C-3809.)

On or about September 30, 1922, the United States attorney for the Northern District of Ohio, acting upon a report by the Secretary of Agriculture, filed in the District Court of the United States for said district a libel, and on December 7, 1922, an amended libel, praying the seizure and condemnation of 400 cases of cherries, remaining in the original unbroken cases at Akron, Ohio, alleging that the article had been shipped by the Francis H. Haserot Co., Traverse City, Mich., on or about August 14, 1922, and transported from the State of Michigan into the State of Ohio, and charging adulteration in violation of the Food and Drugs Act. The article was labeled in part: "Mission Brand Pitted Cherries Francis H. Haserot Co. Packers Factory - Haserot Pier Grand Traverse Bay, Mich. The Haserot Company Distributors Cleveland, Ohio."

Adulteration of the article was alleged in the libel for the reason that it consisted wholly or in part of a filthy, decomposed, and putrid vegetable substance.

On March 23, 1923, the Francis H. Haserot Co. having appeared as claimant for the property and having admitted the allegations of the libel, judgment of condemnation was entered, and it was ordered by the court that the product might be released to the said claimant upon payment of the costs of the proceedings and the execution of a bond in the sum of \$1,000, conditioned in part that it be not disposed of in violation of law.

HOWARD M. GOBE, *Acting Secretary of Agriculture.*

**11786. Adulteration and misbranding of vinegar. U. S. v. 129 Cartons of Apple Cider Vinegar. Decree ordering release of product under bond to be relabeled.** (F. & D. No. 16919. I. S. No. 9208-v. S. No. C-2934.)

On November 13, 1922, the United States attorney for the Northern District of Ohio, acting upon a report by the Secretary of Agriculture, filed in the District Court of the United States for said district a libel praying the seizure and condemnation of 129 cartons of apple cider vinegar at Cleveland, Ohio, alleging that the article had been shipped by the Powell Corp., from Canandaigua, N. Y., on or about September 7, 1922, and transported from the State of New York into the State of Ohio, and charging adulteration and misbranding in violation of the Food and Drugs Act. The article was labeled in part: "Tri W Brand \* \* \* 16 Oz. \* \* \* Reduced With Water To 4% Acetic Strength Pure Apple Cider Vinegar."

Adulteration of the article was alleged in the libel for the reason that distilled vinegar had been mixed and packed with and substituted wholly or in part for the said article.

Misbranding was alleged for the reason that the statement, "Pure Apple Cider Vinegar," was false and misleading and deceived and misled the purchaser. Misbranding was alleged for the further reason that the article was an imitation of and offered for sale under the distinctive name of another article.